



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

VOL. LVIII.

BOSTON, OCTOBER, 1896.

No. 9

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY,
PUBLISHERS,
NO. 3 SOMERSET STREET, BOSTON, MASS.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
EDITORIAL.	
British Views of Lord Salisbury's Proposals.	221
EDITORIAL NOTES.	222-226
Appeal to our Friends—Li Hung-Chang—Gladstone on War—Probabilities of War in Europe—Turkey and the Powers—Walter S. Logan's View of the Salisbury-Olney Correspondence—The Arbitrator on Dr. Jameson—Anglo-Egyptian Expedition—An International Language—Cuba—Warlike S. S. Superintendents—Norwegian Parliament—Program for Peace Sunday—Swiss Peace Society.	
The Arbitration Discussion; Friendly Criticisms, <i>Cephas Brainerd</i>	226
Lord Russell's Address at Saratoga, concluded.	228
Permanent Anglo-American Arbitration a Moral Necessity, <i>Benjamin F. Trueblood</i>	233
Enormous Loss of Horses in War.	236
Progress of the Arbitration Movement in Europe.	236
Literature of the Civil War.	238

BRITISH VIEWS OF LORD SALISBURY'S PROPOSALS.

When Lord Salisbury made public the correspondence of the British Government with that of the United States in regard to an arbitration treaty he invited criticism of the course which had been pursued up to that time. He said in the House of Lords on the 17th of July: "We have need to know what is the trend of public opinion on these matters. We desire, in a question which is certainly not one of party, that the best intellects that we have on both sides should apply themselves to a matter that affects the welfare of the human race in a singular degree, and especially the good relations of a state with which we so desire to be on good terms as the United States of America. Therefore we have laid the papers on the table, and we hope to derive from such attention as noble lords on both sides of the House may devote to them much guidance with respect to the subsequent conduct of the negotiations that we have to pursue."

When the Prime Minister said "noble lords on both sides of the House" he doubtless had his mind's eye on

the much larger body of critics beyond the House of Lords to which he was submitting the correspondence. So far as we have been able to gather, the general verdict in Great Britain has been that the Prime Minister, while animated by an excellent spirit, has been altogether too cautious and fearful. English confidence in arbitration seems to be as advanced as American. The *Daily Chronicle* said:

"Lord Salisbury's position is untenable. We suggest this in no controversial spirit, but rather in response to Lord Salisbury's own request for criticisms and opinions such as might assist the further development of this hopeful correspondence. Those who have read our summary of the despatches will have observed that Lord Salisbury is throughout beset by the idea of caution. We do not blame him, for the proposed treaty is a thing too momentous to be settled without the utmost circumspection. But of caution, as of all else, one can have too much. Lord Salisbury has so far insisted on a triple safeguard. He claims that either nation may refuse to enter into arbitration at all, on any point in which it chooses to consider that its 'honor or integrity' is involved. Then he demands that there shall be, over and above the agreed arbitration authority, a balanced tribunal of appeal without any umpire indifferent to either nationality. And finally he insists that after all is said and done, either nation may at its pleasure reject the award, unless a majority of the judges of its own court have decided against its protest. Now we say, after very careful consideration of the issue, that this position will not do. An agreement to arbitrate, if it is anything at all, is an agreement to submit one's own probably biassed and quite possibly erroneous view to the judgment of some competent judge who has no interest either way. To say that such a tribunal cannot be had, is to say that arbitration is hopeless, and war the only issue. * * * * Of equal importance is it that the General Treaty of Arbitration, whatever may be its precise limits of action, should not contain the seeds of its own destruction. If a nation binds itself to arbitrate a question, it must in honor engage itself also to accept the arbitrator's award. If it goes into a transaction of this character with the determination only to accept a decision which happens to suit it, the whole process is doomed to failure."

The Right Hon. John Morley, in an able article in the *Nineteenth Century* for August, takes the same position. He says:

"No fault can be found with Lord Salisbury for pro-

ceeding, as he says, with 'very considerable caution and circumspection.' The British Empire is unlike any other that the world now sees or has ever seen, in the multiplicity, the diversity, the complication, the interdependence of all its relations and concerns by land and by sea, and its rulers are under an unsleeping obligation not to be tempted, for the sake of healing a mischief in a part, to overlook the possibility of mischief to the vast whole. The spirit of international peace has dreams as the spirit of conquest has them, and it is possible that a policy of adventure in pursuit of the blessings of peace might bring with it as many dangers as a policy of adventure in the less blessed sphere of aggrandizement and war.

"On the other hand, Lord Salisbury, though he shows abundance of incidental acuteness and sagacity, hardly conducts the controversy with the vigorous grasp of a man who has energetically thought the thing out as a whole, or with the resolute faith of a man who means to drive lions from the path, and to bring the business strenuously through. The Minister, sometimes, almost carries circumspection to the point of timidity. This timidity seems mainly to arise from his failure, in the language of science, to isolate his phenomenon — from his failure, in other words, to keep steadily in view that he is discussing, not a great system of universal peace all over the civilized world, but only a particular scheme for promoting peace between England and the United States."

We do not know the nature of the reply contemplated by Lord Salisbury to Mr. Olney's last despatch dated the 22d of June, but it is evident from his public utterances and those of Mr. Balfour that the criticisms of the British press and public men have had a marked effect upon the Prime Minister and that he is likely to yield much of the ground heretofore taken by him, in order to come to a satisfactory agreement with Secretary Olney. Just before Parliament was prorogued on the 14th of August Mr. Balfour, Government leader in the House of Commons, said, in reply to a question from Mr. Harcourt, that the "Government had every expectation that pending negotiations would lead to an early and satisfactory result." This was said in reference to Venezuela, but, as we said last month, the two subjects are so intimately connected that progress in one necessarily involves progress in the other.

Still more significant was the utterance of Salisbury himself in a speech at Dover after the adjournment of Parliament: "I trust that as to the other matter to which you were good enough to allude — namely, the efforts which her Majesty's advisers are making, in conjunction with the Government of the United States, to withdraw a portion of the causes that have led mankind from ages past to the terrible judgment of the battlefield — I trust that I shall bear in mind the encouragement which you and those whom you represent have given me to-day, and I earnestly hope that it may be the fate of my colleagues and myself to win this peaceful victory, which, if it is won, will be more precious than the many victories with which this part of the island is associated."

American comment on the subject has everywhere been such as to assure Secretary Olney that he will have the

heartiest support of his fellow countrymen in further efforts to bring to a successful termination this negotiation so momentous in its bearings on the future of civilization. He may not be able to secure a treaty as comprehensive as most of us would like to see. But it is certain that, if a treaty shall be agreed to which will remove a considerable number of important questions from the peril of war, other cases, and most likely all other cases, of difference will hasten to put themselves under shelter of the same treaty. The best sentiment of both countries unites in urging the distinguished men at the head of the two governments to bring to a speedy conclusion the negotiations which have already awakened so much hope.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

The year of work now opening before us gives promise of being a very fruitful one for the peace movement. The American Peace Society desires to do more and better work than it has ever done before in promotion of the great cause of human brotherhood. We need a large increase of our funds, which are entirely inadequate to the work which ought to be done this fall and winter. We appeal to our friends everywhere to aid us. This you can do by sending liberal contributions for use in the circulation of literature, for which there is a large and growing demand. The circulation of the *Advocate of Peace* ought to be ten times as great as it is now. You can aid by inducing your neighbors and friends to become subscribers, or in circulating the paper at your own expense. For this purpose we shall be glad to make a special rate. We desire to secure the adhesion of at least a thousand new members of the Society before the holidays, and in this way also you can assist us by sending an annual fee of two dollars for yourself, if not already a member, and by asking a number of your friends to join you. We want a group of active workers in every community. The cause is worthy of your best efforts in the neighborhood in which you live. Some of your neighbors and friends have never had the subject intelligently and seriously laid before them; otherwise they would certainly be actively interested in a movement which has every element of inspiration in it. Remember that no good cause goes forward of itself; it is always dependent upon the labors, prayers and sympathies of its friends.

We hope in our next issue to be able to give an account of the Peace Congress at Buda-Pesth which began on the 17th of September and continued its sessions for five days, and of the Interparliamentary Conference which came immediately afterwards. Both gave promise of being unusually interesting occasions, but it has been impossible to get any news of them in time for this issue.